## **EXHIBIT C**

(Excerpted Due to Length)

	1
1	THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
3	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ETHAN P. SCHULMAN, JUDGE
4	DEPARTMENT 304
5	00
6	COORDINATION PROCEEDINGS
7	
8	In Re: Uber Rideshare Cases Case No. CJC-21-005188
	/
9	
L O	
11	
12	
13	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
L <b>4</b>	Thursday, December 7, 2023
15	
16	
L 7	
18	
19	
20	
21	Reported by:
22	Natalie Y. Botelho
23	CSR No. 9897
24	
25	Job No. 6295542

```
2
1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
 3
     For Jane Doe LSA & LS Plaintiffs:
 4
              LEVIN SIMES ABRAMS LLP
              BY: WILLIAM A. LEVIN, ESQ.
 5
              BY: DAVID B. GRIMES, ESQ.
              BY:
                   BELA VEKSLER (via Zoom)
              1700 Montgomery Street, Suite 250
 6
              San Francisco, CA 94111
 7
              (415)426-3000
              wlevin@levinsimes.com
              dgrimes@levinsimes.com
8
9
     For Jane Doe WHBE Plaintiffs:
              WILLIAMS HART BOUNDAS
10
              BY: BRIAN ABRAMSON, ESQ.
11
              BY:
                   JOHN EDDIE WILLIAMS, ESQ.
              BY: WALT CUBBERLY, ESQ.
12
              8441 Gulf Freeway, Suite 600
              Houston, TX 77017
13
              (713)230-2200
              babramson@whlaw.com
14
              jwilliams@whlaw.com
              wcubberly@whlaw.com
15
     For Plaintiff Jane Doe EB:
16
              ESTEY & BOMBERGER
17
              BY:
                   STEPHEN ESTEY, ESQ. (via Zoom)
              2869 Indiana Street
18
              San Diego, CA 92103-6011
              (619)295-0035
19
              steve@estey-bomberger.com
20
     For Plaintiffs:
21
              PEIFFER WOLF CARR CANE CONWAY & WISE, LLP
              BY: ANGELA J. NEHMENS, ESQ.
22
              4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400
              San Francisco, CA 94111
              (415)636-8482
23
              anehmens@peifferwolf.com
24
25
```

```
3
1
     APPEARANCES (continued):
 2
 3
     For Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc. and Rasier, LLC:
              PAUL WEISS RIFKIND WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
 4
              BY: KYLE SMITH, ESQ.
 5
              BY: CAITLIN E. GRUSAUSKAS, ESQ.
              1285 Avenue of the Americas
              New York, NY 10019
 6
              (212)373-3573
 7
              ksmith@paulweiss.com
              cgrusauskas@paulweiss.com
 8
              PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
9
              BY: RANDY LUSKEY, ESQ.
              535 Mission Street, 24th Floor
              San Francisco, CA 94105
10
               (628)432-5112
11
              rluskey@paulweiss.com
12
13
     Also Present: Multiple unidentified counsel
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

perhaps there's coding bias in the initial review.

That's our problem to eat, not theirs.

At the end of the day, our concern is getting the protocol nailed down, not turning it into a big expert fight. Just use Relativity's built-in Elusion with Recall software and produce all of the data.

I think that's the second part that

Ms. Grusauskas kind of glided over a little bit, is we want a more robust set of data reported at the end of a validation test, which Relativity's test automatically outputs. It puts out a whole set of data, whereas they're offering us, I think, four or five really discrete items of data that really enables, I think, cherrypicking, misleading statistics.

We just want the full transparency, and the best way to get full transparency is use the software off the shelf and just tell us all the data that comes out of it and not turn it into a convoluted expert fight and et cetera. We're trying to avoid that for you, for ourselves, for Uber. Just keep it simple. Use the off-the-shelf product, listen to what it says.

THE COURT: All right. Look, it's the end of the day. I've been doing my best to follow along with all this stuff. Needless to say, you folks understand it far better than I. I'm just going to give you this

feedback, which is I am not inclined to try and micromanage how Uber reviews and produces documents, particularly where they're relying on expert who apparently you acknowledge is an expert in the field.

MR. GRIMES: Well, I do, but she also makes some statements in her declaration in support of them that are contradicted by statements she made in other litigations, so...

THE COURT: It's at a level of detail that I'm unlikely to be persuaded to intervene on. I will encourage you, as I do on every topic, to continue to meet and confer. I mean, maybe there is a way -- if what you're asking for are certain reports that are available as defaults within this tool, maybe there's a way that Uber can provide those or a sampling of those along the way to give you some assurance that the way they're doing this is coming out roughly the same way that the way you would have them do it is.

But I just -- as I say, I don't think perfection is the standard here. I think it's reasonableness. And I don't see -- I mean, I'll look at the cases if you force me to, but I don't see that I'm going to have a basis for saying that Uber can't do this the way they want to do it based on expert advice that they've got. It's just not within my portfolio.

	141
1	
2	
3	
4	I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
5	Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify;
6	That the foregoing proceedings were taken
7	before me at the time and place herein set forth, and
8	that a verbatim record of the proceedings was made by me
9	using machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed
10	under my direction; further, that the foregoing is an
11	accurate transcription thereof.
12	I further certify that I am neither
13	financially interested in the action nor a relative or
14	employee of any attorney or any of the parties.
15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date
16	subscribed my name.
17	
18	Dated: December 11, 2023
19	
20	Natalie 4. Bottle
21	Marian graduce
	NATALIE Y. BOTELHO
22	CSR No. 9897
23	
24	
25	